


Montana State Library

This cover sheet created by Internet Archive for formatting.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Montana State Library

S
328.05
L1131
Vol. X, No. 3

SHELVED WITH
PERIODICAL
1 of
ve Council

Montana State Library
3 0864 1004 4146 1

PLEASE RETURN

THE INTERIM

AUGUST 1995 HELENA, MONTANA STATE DOCUMENTS CONNECTION

AUG 07 1995

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COUNCIL
MONTANA STATE LIBRARY
HELENA, MONTANA 59620

EQC Meets in July...The Environmental Quality Council met on July 6 in the Capitol Building. The Council adopted a generalized interim work plan. The Council's work over the interim will include:

- (1) comprehensively analyzing the enforcement and compliance procedures of the state's environmental and natural resource programs (HJR 10 interim study);
- (2) continuing the Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Implementation Project and assisting state agencies in integrating regulatory impacts analysis on private property rights into the MEPA environmental review process;
- (3) receiving updates on the Department of Environmental Quality's study of the elimination of joint and several liability under the state superfund statutes;
- (4) receiving updates on general water policy issues; and
- (5) analyzing the merits of an internal environmental risk assessment and prioritization process.

Council Discusses Other Issues... Other issues discussed included an update on the state forest management planning process, discussion of the issues surrounding the Butte-Silver Bow streamside tailings cleanup process, and an update on the Cenex Pipeline review process.

To Meet in September...The Environmental Quality Council will meet on Thursday and Friday, September 14 and 15. The Council will receive a half day training session on the implementation of the Montana Environmental Policy Act. The Council will also fine-tune and finalize its interim work plan. Other agenda items have not yet been scheduled.

For more information on these issues, please contact the EQC staff at (406) 444-3742.

LEGISLATIVE SERVICES DIVISION

LIBRARY

Senate Committee Minutes Processed...With the exception of the Senate Natural Resources Committee, all Senate committee minutes from the 1995 Legislative Session have been processed for conversion to microfiche and transmitted to the Historical Society Archives [225 N. Roberts, Helena, MT 59620-1201 406/444-4775] The transmittal process for House committee minutes is about two-thirds complete.

If you have questions about the status of a particular set of minutes, please call the Library at (406) 444-3064.

Gambling Report Available...The Montana Dept. of Justice, Gambling Control Division's Biennial Report, Fiscal Years 1993 and 1994 and the Report of the 1993-1994 Gaming Advisory Council are now available. The Division report covers the 1993 and 1995 revisions to Montana's gambling laws, gambling statistics, Division activities, and statutory revisions. The Council's report covers their deliberations and activities and proposed statutory revisions.

Persons interested in obtaining a copy of these reports should contact Wilbur W. Rehmann, Administrative Officer, Gambling Control Division, (406) 444-1971.

ADMINISTRATIVE CODE COMMITTEE

The Administrative Code Committee (ACC) was established in 1975 as a permanent committee to review all proposed rules, amendments to

rules, and rule repeals filed with the Secretary of State under the Montana Administrative Procedure Act (MAPA). Under MAPA, the ACC may:

- (1) review the incidence and conduct of administrative proceedings under MAPA;
- (2) review all proposed rules;
- (3) require an agency proposing a rule to hold a hearing on the rule;
- (4) submit oral and written testimony at an agency's rulemaking hearing;
- (5) require an agency to publish the full or partial text of rule material adopted and incorporated by reference to the material;
- (6) obtain an agency's rulemaking records for the purpose of reviewing compliance with statutory validity requirements;
- (7) require an agency to prepare an economic impact statement regarding a rule proposal;
- (8) petition an agency for the adoption, amendment, or repeal of a rule;
- (9) make a written objection to an agency regarding a proposed or adopted rule;
- (10) make a written recommendation to an agency for the adoption, amendment, or repeal of a rule;
- (11) poll the Legislature to determine whether a proposed rule is consistent with the Legislature's intent;
- (12) make a recommendation to the Legislature regarding an agency's grant of rulemaking authority;
- (13) petition an agency for a declaratory ruling on the applicability of an agency rule;
- (14) seek judicial review of an emergency rule;

- (15) institute, intervene in, or otherwise participate in proceedings involving MAPA in the state and federal courts and administrative agencies;
- (16) require an agency to give the ACC copies of documents filed in a proceeding involving the interpretation of MAPA or an agency rule; and
- (17) require an agency to review its rules biennially to determine if rules should be adopted, amended, or repealed.

In addition to the above powers under MAPA, the ACC may remind an agency that the Legislature holds the power of the purse and may not look favorably upon an agency in the next regular session if the agency exceeds its rulemaking authority or plays fast and loose with either that authority or the legislative intent behind a statute. The ACC may also, under its inherent powers as a legislative committee, draft and introduce legislation relating to MAPA; an agency's grant of rulemaking authority; the adoption, amendment, or repeal of a rule; or other matters relating to rulemaking.

ACC members for the 1995-1996 interim are Senators Larry Baer, Don Hargrove, Terry Klampe, and Gary Forrester and Representatives Matt Denny, Marge Fisher, Deb Kottel, and Dore Schwinden.

For more information about the ACC or to be included on the interested persons' list, please contact John MacMaster at the Legislative Services Division, (406) 444-3064.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION POLICY AND BUDGET

Officers Elected...At its first meeting on July 24, the Joint Committee on Postsecondary Education Policy and Budget (PEPB) elected Senator Greg Jergeson, Chair and Representative Don Holland, Vice Chair. Other committee members include Senators Mignon Waterman, Daryl Toews, and Arnie Mohl, Representatives Ray Peck, Steve Vick, and Carley Tuss, Regents Jim Kaze and Paul Boylan, Governor's representative Pat Haffey, and student representative Chato Hazelbaker.

Reports Received...The Committee received copies of prior PEPB recommendations as presented in the Legislative Fiscal Report, 1997 Biennium and reports from the Commissioner of Higher Education on:

- (1) duplication-elimination-consolidation of programs;
- (2) tribal college contracts;
- (3) transfer of credits; and
- (4) "The Restructuring of the Montana University System, Phase Two."

Other Action...In other action, the Committee:

- (1) approved Committee rules;
- (2) considered the allowable 30 percent carryover of funds unspent by the prior Committee and voted to revert the entire unspent balance to the general fund;
- (3) approved funding for staff expenses; and
- (4) approved reports to be presented by the Commissioner of Higher Education and Legislative Fiscal Division staff at its next meeting on October 23, 1995.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Council Holds Retreat...The Legislative Council met in a retreat setting at the University of Montana Biological Station at Yellow Bay on Flathead Lake July 8. The primary purpose of the meeting was to give the members of the newly reorganized Legislative Council an opportunity to consider its role and scope in light of the branch reorganization directed by Senate Bill 398. The Council also undertook several items of ordinary business. The following summarizes action taken:

- Agreed to not concur in the permanent appointment of Todd Everts as Legislative Environmental Analyst (LEA) at this time, pending adoption of a pay plan and personnel procedures. The Council authorized EQC to hire Mr. Everts as temporary LEA at a Grade 20.
- Agreed that the Environmental Policy Office be a parallel office within the Legislative Services Division.
- Agreed to have an interim study on veterans' affairs as set forth in HJR 19. There is \$10,000 appropriated for this study.

Council Considers Personnel Issues...The Council agreed to the appointment of a formal personnel subcommittee. Sen. Brown will chair the Subcommittee; other members are Sen. Christiaens, Rep. Peck, and Rep. Menahan. The Personnel Subcommittee was directed to ask the Finance Committee and the Audit Committee to each appoint two members to the Subcommittee. (The Finance Committee has since designated Senator Fred Van Valkenburg and Representative Royal Johnson to serve while the Audit Committee has designated Senator Greg Jergeson and Representative Ernest Bergsagel.)

The Personnel Subcommittee is responsible for the pay plan, classification review, Legislative Services Division organization chart, general personnel policy, creation of a branch-wide personnel position, evaluation of managers, and establishment of a liaison from the Council to the legislative employees. The goal of all of this is to clarify policies for the branch. The Subcommittee will make sure that all recommendations are subject to a comment period.

The Council determined, based on staff comments and recommendations from the directors, that a classification review of all the permanent positions should be done as soon as possible. To this end, a request for proposals was prepared and distributed in mid-July. The Personnel Subcommittee plans to meet on August 10 to work on the review of the proposals received.

Council to Develop Mission Statement...The Council also appointed a Subcommittee on Legislative Improvement and Council Mission. Rep. Mercer will chair this Subcommittee and Rep. Larson, Sen. Crippen, and Sen. Halligan will serve as members. The purpose of this Subcommittee is to set forth the Council mission in writing, to consider issues for improvement of the Legislature, and to evaluate these ideas. The Council identified a number of possible legislative improvement issues in a short brainstorming session. The Subcommittee invites all legislators and others with an interest in legislative improvement to submit ideas for review.

Subcommittees to be Permanent...Both Subcommittees are considered by the Council to be permanent standing subcommittees of the Council and are recommended to be continued in subsequent years so long as they contribute to the better operation of the Legislature.

REVENUE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

ROC Meets in June...The Revenue Oversight Committee met June 16. The Committee met jointly with the Legislative Finance Committee to review the Legislative Fiscal Report prepared by the Legislative Fiscal

Analyst. A discussion of that report appeared in the July 1995 edition of *THE INTERIM*.

Committee Hears Legislative Summary...Following the joint meeting the Committee reconvened to conduct its business. Jeff Martin, Committee staff, presented a report that summarized the provisions of tax legislation enacted during the 1995 Session. The summary included a brief overview of legislation affecting the payment or administration of individual income and corporation license taxes, old fund liability taxes, property taxes, cigarettes and tobacco product taxes, motor fuel taxes, mineral taxes, and miscellaneous taxes. The summary listed for each bill, where appropriate, sections amended, sections enacted, sections repealed, effective dates, applicability dates, and termination dates.

The summary also included a composite of the new oil and natural gas production tax rates in SB 412 (generally revise the taxation of oil and natural gas production) as modified by HB 90 (exempt first 3 barrels/day of stripper oil from production taxes), HB 418 (increase privilege and license tax on oil and natural gas producers), and SB 338 (exempt from production taxes oil and natural gas produced by a well drilled after 3/31/95).

Mick Robinson, Director, Department of Revenue, also reviewed legislation affecting the Department.

Revenue Estimating Process Reviewed...The Revenue Oversight Committee is required by law to prepare an estimate of the amount of revenue available for appropriation for the ensuing biennium. Terry Johnson, Principal Analyst, Legislative Fiscal Analyst, described the Committee's responsibilities in establishing the initial revenue estimates for the Legislature. Johnson reviewed the major economic assumptions that the Committee must consider. He said that the Fiscal Analyst and the Governor's Budget Office use state and federal government data, various industry surveys, income tax return data, and private forecasters (e.g., Wharton Econometrics) to make recommendations to the Committee. Based on these recommendations, the Committee adopts the economic assumptions that drive the revenue estimates.

Steve Bender, Assistant Budget Director, Office of Budget and Program Planning, told the Committee that the state has renewed its contract with Wharton Econometrics (WEFA) for forecasting services. Part of the contract includes in-state consultation services. Bender recommended that the Committee invite a representative of WEFA to talk about the importance of WEFA forecasts to the state revenue estimating process. The Committee agreed that a presentation be included for the September 1995 and September 1996 meetings.

Study Proposals Considered...The Montana Legislature typically assigns one or two interim studies to the Revenue Oversight Committee. During the 1995 Session no interim studies were assigned to the Committee,

leaving the Committee free to undertake its own studies. Staff presented two study proposals for the Committee's consideration. The first study would analyze the effects of proposed changes in federal income tax law on Montana. Proposals at the federal level include major revisions to the existing income tax code, the adoption of a flat tax, or the imposition of a national consumption tax. Because Montana income tax law is closely tied to federal income tax laws, any major revisions at the federal level would have a substantial impact on individual and corporate taxpayers as well as on the state. The purpose of the proposed study would be to enhance the understanding of income taxation in general by comparing and contrasting different tax structures, particularly as they relate to Montana income tax policy.

The other study would address the issue of property tax reform in Montana. The 1995 Legislature considered a number of property tax relief measures, several of which were recycled from the November 1993 Special Session. The Legislature expanded the low-income property tax assistance program and elderly homeowners' and renters' income tax credit (HB 497). In the same bill, the Legislature also provided a temporary, 2-year property tax payment to homeowners whose residential property increased in value by more than 15% as a result of reappraisal. In addition, the Legislature reduced the tax rate on business machinery and equipment from 9% to 6% (SB 417). However, general property tax relief was not provided for owners of residential property or for most other classes of property. As a result, the state may face another property tax revolt. The proposed study would provide a fairly comprehensive summary of the issues and trends related to property taxation in Montana and policy options.

The Committee discussed the study proposals in context of the likely activities of the Montana Tax Policy Task Force created in SB 417. The Committee believed that the study proposals should be coordinated with the Task Force to avoid duplication. The Committee decided to proceed with the analysis of the effects of changes in federal income tax law on Montana. The Committee also directed staff to begin work on an analysis of Montana's property tax structure. However, the Committee voted to delay implementation of the property tax study until after the Task Force meets in September. Chairman Gage will work with the Chairman of the Task Force in an effort to divide up responsibilities. The Committee also directed the Department of Revenue to report to the Committee regarding any proposals to change the taxation or valuation of motor vehicles.

Other Business...The Committee heard a report from the Department of Transportation and the Department of Revenue regarding negotiated tax agreements with the Blackfeet Indian Tribe. Agreements have been signed for the gas tax, cigarette taxes, and alcohol taxes.

Jeff Miller, Administrator, Income Tax Division, Department of Revenue, reported on the processing of income tax returns for tax year 1994. Miller noted that all timely filed claims for refund had been

processed within 45 days of the return due date. He said that the Department has greatly improved the processing of income tax returns. The improvement is significant because the Department, beginning in 1996, must pay interest on refunds not processed within 45 days (HB 293).

Mick Robinson reported on the conversion of state liquor stores to agency stores. The selection of agents will occur later this summer.

To Meet Again on September 29.....The Committee is scheduled to meet September 29. For more information about the Committee, please contact Jeff Martin at the Legislative Services Division, (406) 444-3064.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH REORGANIZATION UPDATE

Legislative Agencies Have New Names...Senate Bill 398 reorganized the legislative branch into one agency that includes the permanent staff and the Legislature. The permanent staff offices are now considered divisions of the new agency with the following new names:

- Legislative Services Division
- Legislative Fiscal Division
- Legislative Audit Division

Senate Bill 398 restructured the former EQC as the Legislative Environmental Policy Office under the Legislative Services Division.

In addition, Senate Bill 398 required the development of a branch pay and classification system and the development of a central administrative services function.

Restructuring to be Done in Phases...The directors of the divisions established the following phases for the restructuring effort:

- | | |
|---------|---|
| Phase 1 | Agency consolidation (COMPLETED) |
| Phase 2 | Central administration restructuring |
| Phase 3 | Pay and classification plans/personnel policy |
| Phase 4 | Review of other legislative services |

Phase 2 is well underway, and a central support function will be established in the Legislative Services Division. Accounting personnel from

each division will be reassigned to the Legislative Services Division and relocated to Rooms 138 and 139 (Legislative Services Division reception area). The primary functions transferred will be accounting and budget, although training, reception, word processing, and other administrative functions will also be coordinated by the new central services unit. Currently in process is the establishment of appropriate staffing levels. A team of administrative staff members has also been established to develop recommendations for restructuring of specific services. The administrative restructuring is anticipated to be complete by October 1.

Phase 3 is underway, as the division directors have developed a draft classification plan that has been presented to the Legislative Council and the Legislative Finance Committee for review. The Legislative Council has appointed a Personnel Subcommittee, to be comprised of 4 members of the Legislative Council, 2 members of the Legislative Finance Committee, and 2 members of the Legislative Audit Committee. The Subcommittee is tasked to develop the pay and classification plan as well as uniform branch personnel policies and deal with other personnel issues. To date, the Subcommittee has authorized the issuance of a request for proposal (RFP) for a classification review of staff positions by a private contractor, and will meet in early August to consider bids.

A team of staff members will be formed in the next few weeks to provide a conduit for the review of other legislative services as part of Phase 4. The team will develop recommendations for restructuring of functions and services for presentation to the division directors.

THE BACK PAGE

Last month, the "Back Page" looked at the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 as a first step in restoring the balance of power between the states and the federal government. This month's article looks at the whole restoration movement and what the states are proposing as a way to restore the balance.

RESTORING THE BALANCE OF POWER: THE STATES TAKE CHARGE

by Connie F. Erickson, Research Analyst
Legislative Services Division

SEEDS OF REBELLION

For many state officials, the 1994 elections signaled the beginning of a rebellion. In the words of Governor George Allen of Virginia:

"And that rebellion was led by people all across the country who felt the federal government has become overly centralized. It became overly burdensome, out of touch, too big and out of reach of the people."

What is causing this uproar in the states? In Pennsylvania, it is the Clean Air Act. In Idaho, it is federal landfill regulations. In New Mexico, it is federal rangeland reforms. In Colorado, it is wolf reintroduction. And in Florida, Arizona, and California, it is federal government immigration policies.

All across the country, state and local officials are decrying what they call the "emasculatation of the 10th Amendment". They see increasingly activist congresses and presidents, coupled with adverse judicial rulings, as rendering the 10th Amendment nearly impotent. At the same time, available federal money has decreased, leaving states scrambling to find money to fund new federal programs or expansions of existing programs. In some instances, the federal government has imposed sanctions or conditions on the receipt of federal money; the most famous example being the withholding of federal highway funds to force the imposition of a 55-mile-per-hour speed limit.

State officials have also decried the intrusion of the federal government into areas traditionally under state control, such as banking, insurance, and street crime. Governors and legislators have pointed to the innovations in health care, welfare reforms, education, and corrections enacted by the individual states. Ohio Senate President Stanley J. Arnoff expressed the sentiments of many state officials when he said, "It makes more sense to have decisions on domestic policy made at a level closer to the people".

What many of these state officials want is to reestablish a strong but limited federal government, with states and local governments handling a larger share of the responsibility for domestic policy. But not all state officials are enamored by the idea of states gaining more power in the federal system. Connecticut Speaker Pro Tem David Pudlin is concerned about an attempt to reverse federal accomplishments in such areas as civil rights, voting rights, Social Security, and labor protection. He is also concerned that fewer national standards would be bad for the economy. "Do I want to do business with a different set of rules in every state?" Still, even skeptics recognize the need to open the debate on the role of states in the federalist system.

RESTORING STATE SOVEREIGNTY

While many state officials share a belief in the need to restore state sovereignty, they differ in their solutions. The solutions being offered fall into roughly four categories: constitutional amendments, state legislative actions, legal challenges, and a Conference of the States.

Constitutional Approaches

Constitutional approaches include linking unfunded mandate protection to the balanced budget amendment, changes in the way the Constitution can be amended, and attempts to alter or to force enforcement of the 10th Amendment.

Many state officials, while supporting a federal balanced budget amendment, are concerned that such an amendment will shift costs to the states while raiding state revenue sources. These officials want to tie the balanced budget amendment to an amendment that would protect states from these federal cost shifts. As Colorado Senate President Tom Norton puts it, "It would be the supreme irony if the elimination of state sovereignty became an unintended consequence of the national drive to restore fiscal responsibility to the federal government".

Currently, there are two methods for amending the Constitution: a proposal by Congress for an amendment or a call for a constitutional

convention by two-thirds of the state legislatures. A third method currently being discussed would allow three-fourths of the legislatures to offer an amendment that would take effect after two years unless two-thirds of Congress disapproved it.

A solution supported by many state officials would make the Supreme Court the arbiter in disputes between Congress and the states by inserting this language into the 10th Amendment: "Whether a power is one reserved to the states, or to the people, shall be a matter to be decided by the Court." This is referred to as the "and we really mean it" amendment.

Legislative Actions

Some legislatures have attempted to restore the balance of power through legislative actions. These include resolutions to Congress declaring state sovereignty under the 10th Amendment and instructing the federal government to end mandates. Some states have undertaken comprehensive studies of federal mandates and their impact on state budgets and a state's ability to provide services to its citizens. Colorado and Oklahoma have both introduced resolutions to earmark or freeze federal taxes in state bank accounts as a reserve against unfunded mandates.

Legal Challenges

A third approach used by states is litigation. Several states have sued the federal government over federal regulations the states have found onerous. Some examples include immigration (California, Florida, and Texas), clean air (Missouri and Utah), motor voter (South Carolina), intrastate trucking regulation (Oklahoma and Michigan), and the Brady Bill (Montana). Instead of litigation, some states have simply refused to comply with federal regulations. For example, several states have refused to implement the motor voter law.

Conference of the States

A Conference of the States is the brainchild of Governor Mike Leavitt of Utah. With the support of the National Governors Association, the Council of State Governments, and the National Conference of State Legislatures, Governor Leavitt has traveled across the country meeting with state officials and laying the groundwork for the Conference.

The purpose of the Conference is to bring together representatives from every state to develop a plan for restoring the balance to the federal system. Delegates would discuss solutions for restoring the balance of power between the states and the federal government and draft those

solutions as recommendations for the delegations to carry back to their states. Once three-fourths of the state legislatures ratified the recommendations, they would be sent to Congress.

Governor Leavitt and the Conference's supporters have stressed that the Conference must not become a partisan issue nor must it become tied to a single issue such as abortion or gun control.

In order for the Conference to become a reality, 26 states must pass a resolution in support. Once the resolutions are passed, the Conference will be convened in Philadelphia. The original target date was October 1995.

Although the Conference supporters anticipated passage of the required resolutions by spring 1995, unexpected opposition surfaced in many states. Led by State Senator Charles Duke of Colorado, the opposition has characterized the Conference as an attempt to convene a constitutional convention that would ultimately destroy the 10th Amendment and weaken state power in the federal system rather than strengthen it. The opposition is also fueled by a deep suspicion of governmental activity, and the Conference is viewed as just such an activity. Many Conference opponents are supporters of the 10th Amendment Movement that calls for state legislatures to pass resolutions demanding that power delegated to the states in the U.S. Constitution be restored. Tenth Amendment supporters believe that this is a far better approach than a conference. Sixteen states have passed such a resolution.

Other opponents to the Conference have different concerns. State Representative Cliff Franklin of Kansas expressed concern about the expense of a conference at a time when states are trimming budgets. State Senator Mike Coffman of Colorado voted against the resolution because he doesn't trust his state's leadership. Wisconsin Senator Fred Risser calls the Conference "the most undemocratic structure devised by men" because it calls for one vote per state regardless of the population of the state. A small state like Wyoming could offset the power of a large state like California that has over 30 times the population.

In Montana, the resolution supporting the Conference passed the Senate but was tabled in the House Committee on State/Federal Relations. The arguments for opposing the resolution mirrored the arguments used in other states: fear of a constitutional convention and distrust of government.

As of July 1995, only 14 states had passed the Conference resolution. Another 14 legislatures had passed the resolution in one chamber. Of those 14, however, six legislatures have adjourned for this session.

Resolutions failed or were not introduced in 12 states. Despite these setbacks, Conference supporters are continuing their efforts to bring the Conference to fruition; if not in 1995, then in 1996 or 1997.

WHAT NEXT?

Whether they believe in a Conference of the States or resolutions demanding adherence to the 10th Amendment, supporters of the movement to restore the balance of power in the federal system agree that the time is ripe for change, and if they do not take this opportunity, it may not come around again. The movement has the support of many governors and state legislators and is aided by the presence of a Republican congressional majority that is desirous of returning power to the states.

For the movement to succeed, however, supporters must address certain issues that could derail the effort if left untouched. The first issue is that in some people's minds, states' rights is equated with opposition to civil rights. These people fear that returning power to the states could result in a loss of protections for average citizens and the devastation of the disenfranchised.

Another issue that must be faced is that of trust in and respect for both state government and the federal government. This issue not only divides the supporters and the opponents of the movement to restore the balance of power, it divides the supporters as well. This split is especially evident in the controversy surrounding the Conference of the States.

Whether the supporters use constitutional changes, legislative actions, legal challenges, or a Conference of the States, the movement to restore the balance of power is gaining momentum, and its success depends on how well its supporters can make the case for reducing the role of the federal government and making the states more of a power in our federal system.



INTERIM CALENDAR

UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED,
ALL ROOM DESIGNATIONS ARE IN THE CAPITOL

AUGUST

July 31 and August 1, Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Study
Commission, Miles City

August 4, Subcommittee on Foreign Investment Depository, Room
104, 9 a.m.

August 10, Committee on Indian Affairs, Room 104, 10 a.m.

August 10, Legislative Council Personnel Subcommittee, Room 108

August 11, Legislative Audit Committee, Room 104

August 24, Oversight Committee on Children and Families, Room 104,
1 p.m.

August 25, Oversight Committee on Children and Families, Room 427,
8 a.m.

SEPTEMBER

September 4, Labor Day, holiday

September 14 and 15, Environmental Quality Council

September 22, Subcommittee on Foreign Investment Depository

September 29, Revenue Oversight Committee, Room 104

OCTOBER

October 9, Columbus Day, holiday

October 13, Legislative Finance Committee, Room 104, 8 a.m.

October 23, Joint Committee on Postsecondary Education Policy and
Budget, Room 104

October 27, Subcommittee on Foreign Investment Depository, Missoula

360 copies of this public document were published at an estimated cost of 55¢ per copy, for a total cost of \$198.00, which includes \$118.00 for printing and \$80.00 for distribution.

Montana Legislative Council
State Capitol Room 138
Helena MT 59620-1706

